

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 18-20, and 35-43 are pending and stand rejected. All pending claims are believed to be allowable over the references cited by the Examiner as discussed below. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for the present application is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-4, 10, 18, 20, 35-37, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hennings.

Independent claim 1 generally recites a method for providing a search result to a user that includes receiving a search query, generating a search result associated with a search result document link to a search result document, generating an instruction to a document browser to navigate directly to an intra-document portion within the search result document when the search result is selected by the user, and providing the search result to the user.

In contrast, Hennings discloses a method to promote contextual information to display pages containing hyperlinks. Specifically, Hennings promotes contextual information by including more information pertaining to the linked document than the hyperlink contained in the display page.

The Examiner contends that the mention of “a user may fill in a form requesting a database search” (col. 6, lines 19-21) in the background section of Hennings as reading on “receiving a search query” of claim 1. However, the discussion in the background section of Hennings is nothing more than a lengthy and detailed background discussion on general web applications, such as a search engine. It is completely unrelated to the aspects of Hennings’ promotion of the contextual information to which the Examiner references with regard to the remainder of claim 1. In other words, Hennings’ promotion of the contextual information does not disclose or teach “receiving a search query” as recited in claim 1.

With regard to the second clause of claim 1, namely, “generating at least one search result ... associated with a search result document link to a search result document,” the Examiner contends that the homepage 100 of Hennings is a result in response to a user request. However, the homepage 100 is not a search result generated in response to the search query. At the most, it is merely a “result” of a user request for the specific URL for the homepage 100.

In addition, the Examiner reads that “the homepage 100 associated text hyperlink anchors to another webpage 118 as a search result document” on “the search result being associated with a search result document link to a search result document” of claim 1. The Examiner notes that clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 links the browser to Cruises page 118 as an example of the search result. However, again, neither the homepage 100 nor any of its contents was generated as a result of the search query.

Claim 1 further recites that an instruction is generated to navigate directly to an intra-document portion within the search result document, the intra-document portion being related to the search query. The Examiner contends that the hierarchy of the homepage 100 and its hyperlinks read on this clause of claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner contends that the homepage 100 is at the top level of the content hierarchy and there is a nested page for each of the travel categories that can be reached. Independent claim 35 recites similar elements.

However, as described by Hennings, “FIG. 3A illustrate the file structure of the documents that comprise the web site of FIG. 2.” (Col. 8, lines 66-67, emphasis added). In other words, homepage 100 is a web page that includes a number of hyperlinks to other documents, the file structure of those document being shown in FIG. 3A. Not only is homepage 100 not a search result, but the hyperlinks contained therein are merely links to the target document (see col. 10, lines 17-20) and do not contain any instruction to navigate directly to an intro-document portion of the target document.

The Examiner is reading the entire web content of the web site as a single “document” when such interpretation is neither supported by the specification of the Applicant’s application (as the claims are to be interpreted and read in light of the specification) nor by the specification of Hennings, nor, indeed, by the common use of the term “document” with regard to web content.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of the independent claims as well as claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Call.

Independent claim 18 generally recites a method for providing a search result that includes generating a search result in response to a search query that includes a snippet extracted from the search result document, the search result being associated with a cached link to a

cached search result document, and returning the cached search result document automatically scrolled to a portion of the cached search result document containing the snippet in response to the cached link being selected by the user.

In contrast, Call discloses a method for disseminating product information using existing universal product codes (bar codes) as access keys. Specifically, Call uses a cross-referencing resource that receives Internet request messages containing all or part of a universal product code and returns the Internet address at which information about the identified product may be obtained.

Call does not disclose or suggest generating a search result search result that includes a snippet extracted from the search result document. Rather, Call automatically redirects the request message to the destination URL (see, e.g., block 327 in FIG. 4 and col. 3, lines 41-46; col. 18, lines 7-12).

Call also fails to disclose or suggest that the search result is associated with a cached link to a cached search result document. Instead, no mention of caching is made nor is such caching necessary or desirable in Call's application.

Furthermore, Call does not disclose or suggest returning the cached search result document automatically *scrolled to a portion of the cached search result document* containing the snippet in response to the cached link being selected by the user. Although Call discloses a link to only that portion of an XML product description," such a feature is not the same or equivalent to scrolling to the portion of the search result document containing the snippet. Scrolling to the target portion has the added advantage that the user has immediate access to portions before and after the snippet. In contrast, Call only returns a portion of the XML product description *without* information adjacent thereto.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of the independent claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5-7 and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hennings in view of Caronni. Claims 8, 9, 41, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hennings in view of Hill. Claims 11 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hennings in view of Streble. Claim 19 stands

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Call in view of Jensen-Grey and as being unpatentable over Hennings in view of Jensen-Grey. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Call in view of Hennings.

However, each of these dependent claims is believed to be allowable at least because the independent claim from which it depends is allowable as discussed above and the addition of the secondary references do not make up for the deficiencies of the primary references as discussed above.


In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 5-9, 11, 19, 20, 38-42, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter accompanying this document is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136 and/or any other relief is required, Applicant hereby petitions for any required relief including Extensions of Time and/or any other relief and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. **50-1217** (Order No. **GOOGP017**).

Respectfully submitted,



Jung-hua Kuo
Reg. No. 41,918
P.O. Box 3275
Los Altos, CA 94024
Telephone: (650) 988-8070
Facsimile: (650) 988-8090